UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,580	12/20/2007	Philip A. Beachy	JHU2010-1	2018
²⁸²¹³ DLA PIPER LI	7590 03/23/200 .P (US)	9	EXAMINER	
4365 EXECUTIVE DRIVE SUITE 1100 SAN DIEGO, CA 92121-2133			HUFF, SHEELA JITENDRA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1643	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/564,580	BEACHY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_			
	Sheela J. Huff	1643				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	<i>,</i>					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-67</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-67</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)	A) 🔲 Indonésia u Consessano	/DTO 412\				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	te				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P.	atent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	o) 🔲 Oulet					

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

To have a general inventive concept under PCT rule 13.1, the inventions need to be linked by a special technical feature. The special technical feature recited in claim 1 is the abnormal elected Hedgehog activity that causes tumor cell proliferation being treated with a Hedgehog antagonist. In view of this Berman et al Nature vol. 425 p. 846 (2003) reads on the claim. Berman et al disclose an Hedgehog-neutralizing antibody and its growth-inhibitory effects (see abstract). Therefore the technical feature recited in claim 1 is not special. Accordingly the groups are not so linked as to form a single general concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in response to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-22, drawn to method of reducing or inhibiting proliferation of cells of a digestive tract tumor using an antagonist wherein said antagonist is a peptide.

Group II, claim(s) 1-22, drawn to method of reducing or inhibiting proliferation of cell proliferation of a digestive tract tumor using an antagonist wherein said antagonist is a polynucleotide.

Group III, claim(s) 1-22, drawn to method of reducing or inhibiting proliferation of cells of a digestive tract tumor using an antagonist wherein said antagonist is a peptidomimetic.

Group IV, claim(s) 1-22, drawn to method of reducing or inhibiting proliferation of cells of a digestive tract tumor using an antagonist wherein said antagonist is a small organic molecule.

Art Unit: 1643

Group V, claim(s) 1-22, drawn to method of reducing or inhibiting proliferation of cells of a digestive tract tumor using an antagonist wherein said antagonist is an antibody.

Page 3

Group VI, claim(s) 23-46, drawn to identifying a digestive tract tumor wherein said identification is done using a polypeptide.

Group VII, claim(s) 23-46, drawn to identifying a digestive tract tumor wherein said identification is done using a polynucleotide.

Group VIII, claim(s) 47-67, drawn to identifying an agent to treat digestive tract tumor.

The inventions listed as Groups I-VIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: As set forth above, in view of the teaching of Berman et al the groups are not so linked as to form a single general concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because the technical feature of claim 1 is not special.

Inventions I-VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions use different reagents and/or have different method steps and different end results. For example, the methods of Groups I-V each use a chemically, structurally and functionally different product. Specifically, the product of Group I is a peptide and the product of Group II is a polynucleotide. Peptides are composed of amino acid residues whereas polynucleotides are composed of nucleotides.. The peptides of Group I are composed of a unique and distinct sequence of amino acids that is distinct from the sequence of the antibodies of Group V. The product of Group IV contains distinct chemical structures not found in Groups I-III and V. The methods of

Groups VI-VII have different end results than the methods of Groups I-V because they are directed to identifying a digestive tract tumor whereas the methods of Groups I-V are directed to an inhibition. Similarly, the method of Group VIII has a different end result, which is the identification of an agent.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C.101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement

may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheela J. Huff whose telephone number is 571-272-0834. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6am to 2pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sheela J Huff/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1643